UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/697,405	10/29/2003	Alexander Clemm	50325-0816	7264

29989 7590 07/24/2007

HICKMAN PALERMO TRUONG & BECKER, LLP
2055 GATEWAY PLACE
SUITE 550
SAN JOSE, CA 95110

EXAMINER	
FRINK, JOHN MOORE	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
2142	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
07/24/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/697,405	CLEMM ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	John M. Frink	2142	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-84* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-84* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date *12/16/2003, 5/23/2005*.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Objections

1. Claim 7 is objected to because of the following informalities: 'more edge routers' is written as 'moreedge routers'. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

3. Claims 1, 22, 43 and 64 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Gupta et al. (US 6,763,384 B1) for the reasons given in the International Search Report.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1 – 4, 6, 9, 11 – 14, 18, 22 – 25, 27, 30, 32 – 35, 39, 43 – 46, 48, 51, 53 – 56, 60, 64 – 67, 69, 72, 74 – 77 and 81 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Tse et al. (US 2003/0105856 A1), hereafter Tse, in view of Natarajan et al. (US 2002/0156882 A1), hereafter Natarajan.

3. Regarding claims 1, 22, 43 and 64, Tse shows a method, computer-readable medium carrying instructions that when executed causes a method to be performed, a system, and a system for executing instructions on a computer-readable medium for communicating an alarm in a computer network, comprising: detecting an event associated with a device or any component thereof on the computer network ([0016, 0042]),

in response to detecting the event, propagating an alarm to an alarm identification component ([0042]);

at the alarm identification component, augmenting the alarm with identification information to result in creating an augmented alarm ([0042]);

and transmitting the augmented alarm to a network operations center for the computer network ([0042-0043]).

Tse does not specifically show wherein the device is associated with a particular site in a plurality of sites and said network operations center processes alarms for each site in the plurality of sites.

Natarajan shows wherein the device is associated with a particular site in a plurality of sites and said network operations center processes alarms for each site in the plurality of sites (Figs. 1, 2, 4A, [0029-0030]).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the disclosure of Tse with that of Natarajan in order to support

monitoring large, diverse groups of computers while being able to correctly identify the source of events such as alarms (Natarajan, [0009-0011]).

4. Regarding claims 2, 23, 44 and 65, Tse in view of Natarajan further show where the identification information identifies the particular site in the plurality of sites in which the alarm originated (Natarajan, [0021,0029-0030]).

5. Regarding claims 3, 24, 44 and 66, Tse in view of Natarajan further show wherein the identification information uniquely identifies the device on the computer network (Tse, [0042]).

6. Regarding claims 4, 25, 46 and 67, Tse in view of Natarajan further show wherein the identification information comprises an address for the device on the computer network (Natarajan, [0021]).

7. Regarding claims 6, 27, 48 and 69, Tse in view of Natarajan further show wherein the identification information comprises network information associated with the particular site in which the alarm originated (Natarajan, [0021, 0026]).

8. Regarding claims 9, 30, 51 and 72, Tse in view of Natarajan further show wherein the alarm identification component is in the device that detected the event.

9. Regarding claims 11, 32, 533 and 74, Tse in view of Natarajan further show wherein the step of detecting the event comprises: detecting a condition using a SNMP agent that is in the device (Natarajan, [0022]).

10. Regarding claims 12, 33, 54 and 75, Tse in view of Natarajan further show wherein the step of propagating the alarm is performed by transmission of a SNMP message, a Syslog event, or a CNS bus event (Natarajan, [0022]).

11. Regarding claims 13, 34, 55 and 76, Tse in view of Natarajan further show in response to detecting the event associated with the device, generating the alarm (Natarajan, [0022-0023], Tse Fig. 4B, [0041]) at one member selected from the group consisting of: a switch, a router, (Natarajan, [0030]) an IP phone, a call manager component, a voice mail component, and an event monitoring component.

12. Regarding claims 14, 35, 56 and 77, Tse in view of Natarajan further show creating the identification information based on an address of the device on the computer network (Natarajan, [0021, 0026, 0029-0030]).

13. Regarding claims 18, 39, 60 and 81, Tse in view of Natarajan further show wherein the alarm identification component augments the same identification information for each device in the particular site (Natarajan, [0021] lines 10 – 12, comprising using a customer name for all devices at a particular site).

14. Claims 5, 26, 47 and 68 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tse in view of Natarajan as applied to claims 1, 22, 43 and 64 above, and further in view of Taggart et al. (US 6,944,659 B2), hereafter Taggart.

Tse in view of Natarajan show claims 1, 22, 43 and 64.

Tse in view of Natarajan do not show wherein the identification information comprises geographical information associated with the particular site in which the alarm originated.

Taggart shows wherein the identification information comprises geographical information associated with the particular site in which the alarm originated (col. 4 lines 5 – 6).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the disclosure of Tse in view of Natarajan with that of Taggart in order to allow for an improved way to detect and report events concerning networked appliances that allows a user to accurately determine the exact location of where said event has or is occurring, allowing for more rapid diagnosis and alleviation in the case of a problem (Taggart, col. 1 lines 33 – 36).

15. Claims 7, 8, 15, 28, 29, 36, 45, 50, 57, 70, 71 and 78 are are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tse in view of Natarajan as applied to claims 1, 22, 43 and 64 above, and further in view of Cabrera et al (US 2003/ 0177183 A1), hereafter Cabrera.

16. Regarding claims 7, 28, 49 and 70, Tse in view of Natarajan show claims 1, 22, 43 and 64.

Tse in view of Natarajan do not show wherein the alarm identification component is hosted by one or more edge routers associated with the particular site.

Cabrera shows wherein the alarm identification component is hosted by one or more edge routers associated with the particular site ([0031]).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the disclosure of Tse in view of Natarajan with that of Cabrera in order to fully support a network that utilizes edge routers, which are a common item in networks and thus would be an important feature to ensure wide product functionality (Cabrera [0031]).

17. Regarding claims 8, 29, 50 and 71,Tse in view of Natarajan and Cabrera further show wherein each site in the plurality of sites is a local area network, and wherein the alarm identification component is a router that communicates with one or more edge routers, wherein each of the one or more edge routers is associated with a different site in the plurality of sites (Cabrera [0031], Natarajan [0030]).

18. Regarding claims 15, 36, 57 and 78, Tse in view of Natarajan and Cabrera further show creating the identification information based on an address of an edge router associated with the particular site (Cabrera [0031], Natarajan [0030]).

19. Claims 10, 11, 12, 31, 32, 33, 52, 53, 54, 73, 74 and 75 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tse in view of Natarajan as applied to claims 1, 22, 43 and 64 above, and further in view of Perkins (SNMP Alarms and MIB Module).

20. Regarding claim 10, Tse in view of Natarajan show claims 1, 22, 43 and 64.

Tse in view of Natarajan do not show herein the step of augmenting the alarm with identification information comprises: conveying the identification information in a VarBind portion of a SNMP message associated with the alarm.

Perkins shows herein the step of augmenting the alarm with identification information comprises: conveying the identification information in a VarBind portion of a SNMP message associated with the alarm (Section 4).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the disclosure of Tse in view of Natarajan with that of Perkins as Perkins' disclosure is concerned solely with SNMP Alarms and how they can best be

utilized and leveraged (Perkins, title, Section 1), while Tse in view of Natarajan also enable using and anticipate the use of SNMP for the same purpose (Natarajan [22]).

21. Regarding claims 11, 32, 53 and 74, Tse in view of Natarajan and Perkins further show wherein the step of detecting the event comprises: detecting a condition using a SNMP agent that is in the device (Natarajan, [0022], Perkins Sections 1 and 4).

22. Regarding claims 12, 33, 53 and 75, Tse in view of Natarajan and Perkins further show wherein the step of propagating the alarm is performed by transmission of a SNMP message, a Syslog event, or a CNS bus event (Natarajan, [0022], Perkins Sections 1 and 4).

23. Claims 16, 37, 58 and 79 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tse in view of Natarajan as applied to claims 1, 22, 43 and 64 above, and further in view of Lecheler et al. (US 6,425,008 B1), hereafter Lecheler.

Tse in view of Natarajan show claims 1, 22, 43 and 64.

Tse in view of Natarajan do not show creating the identification information based on a table that maps device addresses to identification information.

Lecheler shows creating the identification information based on a table that maps device addresses to identification information (Fig. 3 item 84).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the disclosure of Tse in view of Natarajan with that of Lecheler in order to reduce the time necessary to respond to an error and reduce the time necessary to correct the error (Lecheler col. 6 lines 22 – 26).

24. Claims 17, 38, 59 and 80 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tse in view of Natarajan as applied to claims 1, 22, 43 and 64 above, further in view of Lecheler, and further in view of Goudreau (US 2004/0213224 A1).

Tse in view of Natarajan show claims 1, 22, 43 and 64, including creating identification information based on an address of an edge router associated with the particular site, (Natarajan [0026, 0029]), and creating the identification information using a set of default identification information associated with the alarm identification component (Natarajan [0021-0023], where in this embodiment a default set of information is used, one embodiment being utilizing the customer name as the default identifier for all alarm components utilized in that customer's site).

Tse in view of Natarajan do not show where the identification information may be created based on a table that maps device addresses to identification information, nor does Tse in view of Natarajan show prioritizing the use of said mapping table over said edge router information.

Lecheler shows where the identification information may be created based on a table that maps device addresses to identification information (Fig. 3 item 84).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the disclosure of Tse in view of Natarajan with that of Lecheler in order to reduce the time necessary to respond to an error and reduce the time necessary to correct the error (Lecheler col. 6 lines 22 – 26).

Tse in view of Natarajan and Lecheler do not show prioritizing the use of said mapping table over said edge router information.

Goudreau shows prioritizing the use of said mapping table over said edge router information, specifically showing where said mapping table is the fastest, most simple method [0009], and providing utilizing edge routers as a more advanced alternative [0003-0007, 0016].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the disclosure of Tse in view of Natarajan and Lecheler with that of Goudreau in order to provide for more advanced traffic management designed to accommodate present and future internet traffic that considers multiple methods of managing said traffic in order to utilize the optimum choice (Goudreau, [0002-0009]).

25. Claims 19, 20, 21, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tse in view of Natarajan as applied to claims 1, 22, 43 and 64 above, and further in view of Dacier et al. (US 2003/0110398 A1), hereafter Dacier.

26. Regarding claims 19, 20, 40, 41, 61, 62, 82 and 83, Tse in view of Natarajan show claims 1, 22, 43 and 64.

Tse in view of Natarajan do not show wherein the device is a first device, wherein the first device and a second device on the computer network both use network address translations, wherein the second device is associated with a different site in a plurality of sites than the first device, wherein the first device and the second device are associated with the same IP address, and wherein the identification information uniquely identifies the alarm associated with the first device

Dacier shows wherein the device is a first device, wherein the first device and a second device on the computer network both use network address translations, wherein

the second device is associated with a different site in a plurality of sites than the first device, wherein the first device and the second device are associated with the same IP address, and wherein the identification information uniquely identifies the alarm associated with the first device (Figs. 1, 2, 3, and 4, [0044], where Firewall 13 of Fig. 1 is a Nat, and thus the machines behind 13 (11, 12, etc) inherently have the same public IP address, and where alarms are still mapped between specific machines).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the disclosure of Tse in view of Natarajan with that of Dacier in order to support processing alarms on more advanced network configurations such as those shown in Dacier, that utilize standardized technology such as NATs, allowing for alarm identification and investigation that yield a root cause for said alarm (Dacier, Abstract).

27. Regarding claims 21, 42, 63 and 84 Tse in view of Natarajan and Dacier further show wherein the augmented alarm is in a plurality of augmented alarms received at the network operations center, and further comprising: creating a view comprising a subset of the plurality of augmented alarms received at the network operations center by filtering the plurality of augmented alarms using a set of criteria (Dacier, Abstract).

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to John M. Frink whose telephone number is (571) 272-9686. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 7:30AM - 5:00PM EST; off alternate Fridays.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Andrew Caldwell can be reached on (571)272-3868. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

John Frink

(571) 272-9686

ANDREW CALDWELL
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER